



December 11, 2013

Mr. James A. Galati, President  
MyComputerCareer.Com/Techskills  
2400 Corporate Exchange Drive, Suite 300  
Columbus, OH 43231-7667

Certified Mail  
Return Receipt Requested  
Domestic Return Receipt  
#7012 1640 0000 0567 9112

RE: **Expedited Final Program Review Determination Letter**  
OPE ID: 041245 00  
PRCN: 201340528438

Dear Mr. Galati:

From August 19, 2013 through August 23, 2013, Tonee Buwana, Sheri Wild, and Nicholas Koulermos conducted a review of MyComputerCareer.com's (MCC.com's) administration of the programs authorized pursuant to Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1070 et seq. (Title IV, HEA programs). The purpose of this Final Program Review Determination Letter is to close the program review.

The focus of the review was to determine MCC.com's compliance with the statutes and federal regulations as they pertain to the institution's administration of Title IV programs. The review consisted of, but was not limited to, an examination of MCC.com's policies and procedures regarding institutional and student eligibility, individual student financial aid and academic files, attendance records, student account ledgers, and fiscal records.

A sample of 30 files was identified for review from the 2011-12 and 2012-13 (year to date) award years. The files were selected randomly from a statistical sample of the total population receiving Title IV, HEA program funds for each award year. One additional student from the random statistical sample was added to the 2012-13 award year review sample for verification testing. Appendix A lists the names and partial social security numbers of the students whose files were examined during the program review.

**Protection of Personally Identifiable Information (PII):**

PII is any information about an individual which can be used to distinguish or trace an individual's identity (some examples are name, social security number, date and place of birth). The loss of PII can result in substantial harm, embarrassment, and inconvenience to individuals and may lead to identity theft or other fraudulent use of the information. Appendix A was encrypted and sent separately to the institution via e-mail.

**Federal Student Aid**  
An OFFICE of the U.S. DEPARTMENT of EDUCATION

Chicago/Denver School Participation Division  
500 West Madison St., Suite 1576, Chicago, Illinois 60661  
StudentAid.gov

PROUD SPONSOR of  
the AMERICAN MIND™

Although the review was thorough, it cannot be assumed to be all-inclusive. The absence of statements in the report concerning MCC.com's specific practices and procedures must not be construed as acceptance, approval, or endorsement of those specific practices and procedures. Furthermore, it does not relieve MCC.com of its obligation to comply with all of the statutory or regulatory provisions governing the Title IV, HEA programs.

The Chicago/Denver School Participation Division has made a Final Program Review Determination concerning the findings that were identified during the program review. Following is a discussion of the findings identified and the resolution of those findings.

### **Program Findings and Final Program Review Determinations:**

#### **Finding #1: R2T4 Calculation Errors**

**Citation:** The Student Assistance General Provisions regulations require that if a Title IV recipient withdraws from an institution during a payment period or period of enrollment in which the recipient began attendance, the institution must determine the amount of Title IV assistance the student earned as of the student's withdrawal date. The institution must also return the amount of the refund allocated to the Title IV programs to the appropriate program accounts within 45 days of the date that the student officially withdrew, was expelled or the institution determined that the student had unofficially withdrawn, or failed to return from a leave of absence. [34 C.F.R. § 668.22(e)]

**Noncompliance:** The return to Title IV (R2T4) calculation for Student #2 omitted PLUS loan funds that had been disbursed. The R2T4 calculation for Student #31 was based on incorrect numbers of days completed and days in the period of enrollment, resulting in an under-return of \$23 in unsubsidized Federal Direct Loan funds.

**Institutional Action Taken to Resolve Noncompliance:** Since Student #2 completed more than 60 percent of the period of enrollment and thus earned 100 percent of the Title IV aid received, there was no practical effect of the R2T4 calculation error. Institutional officials were reminded of the need to include PLUS loan amounts in R2T4 calculations. No further action is required concerning this student.

The reviewers corrected the R2T4 calculation for Student #31. MCC.com returned an additional \$23 in unsubsidized loan funds to the Federal Direct Loan program on 8/19/13 while the reviewers were on site.

**Final Program Review Determination:** MCC.com has taken the corrective actions necessary to resolve this finding. Therefore, MCC.com may consider this finding closed, with no further action required. See Finding #2 below.

## **Finding #2: R2T4 Made Late**

**Citation:** The Student Assistance General Provisions regulations require that if a Title IV recipient withdraws from an institution during a payment period or period of enrollment in which the recipient began attendance, the institution must determine the amount of Title IV assistance the student earned as of the student's withdrawal date. The institution must also return the amount of the refund allocated to the Title IV programs to the appropriate program accounts within 45 days of the date that the student officially withdrew, was expelled or the institution determined that the student had unofficially withdrawn, or failed to return from a leave of absence. [34 C.F.R. § 668.22(e)]

**Noncompliance:** The incorrect R2T4 calculation for Student #31, referenced in Finding #1 above, resulted in the return of all but \$23 in unsubsidized Federal Direct Loan funds on 5/23/13.

**Institutional Action Taken to Resolve Noncompliance:** The additional \$23 in unsubsidized loan funds required by the corrected R2T4 calculation for Student #31 was returned 8/19/13, 83 days beyond the regulatory deadline, while the reviewers were on site.

**Final Program Review Determination:** MCC.com has taken the corrective actions necessary to resolve this finding. MCC.com remains liable to the Department for the Cost of Funds interest for the improperly retained funds. As this amount would be de minimus if quantified, no demand for repayment is made at this time. Therefore, MCC.com may consider this finding closed, with no further action required.

## **Finding #3: Failure to Properly Resolve ISIR Comment Code – Inconsistent Information in Student File**

**Citation:** The Student Assistance General Provisions regulations provide that to be eligible to receive Title IV, HEA program funds, a male student who is subject to registration with the Selective Service must register with the Selective Service, unless the student meets certain registration exemptions described in the regulations. When a male student's FAFSA is processed, a data match is performed to confirm whether the student has registered with the Selective Service. If this data match does not confirm the student's registration, the student can establish that he is registered, is not or was not required to be registered, or has registered since submission of the FAFSA. A student who was required to, but did not, register with the Selective Service is ineligible to receive Title IV, HEA assistance unless he can demonstrate by submitting clear and unambiguous evidence to the institution that he was unable to register for reasons beyond his control; or he is over 26 and did not knowingly and willfully fail to register when he was between the ages of 18 and 26; or he served on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces. An institution may consider that a student did not knowingly and willfully fail to register only if the student submits an advisory opinion from the Selective Service System that does not dispute the student's claim that he did not knowingly and willfully fail to register; and the

institution does not have uncontroverted evidence that the student knowingly and willfully failed to register. [34 C.F.R. § 668.37]

Unless it can be documented that a student who fails the data match was exempt from registration or served on active duty in the armed forces, he must obtain a status information letter from the Selective Service addressing his failure to register. If a student receives any type of letter from the Selective Service other than a general exemption letter (codes E1-E8) or a "DOB before 1960" letter (code NR), the institution must determine based on all relevant evidence whether the student had knowingly and willfully failed to register. The 2012-13 FSA Handbook emphasizes that the type of status letter received should be given considerable weight in an institution's evaluation: "For example, if the student received a letter indicating a compliance letter had been sent (code RL), this would be a negative factor when you make the determination." In making its determination, the institution should consider factors such as where the student lived, whether he claims he thought he was registered, and why he was not aware of the widely publicized requirement to register. [Federal Student Aid Handbook, 2012-13, Vol. 1, Chapter 5, pp. 63-65]

The regulations require an institution to identify and resolve discrepancies in information received from different sources regarding a student's application for financial aid under the Title IV, HEA programs. [34 C.F.R. § 668.16(f)]

**Noncompliance:** Student #12 received \$2,805 in subsidized and \$4,809 in unsubsidized Federal Direct Loan funds despite an ISIR comment code indicating he had failed the Selective Service registration data match. The comment code was not properly resolved and his eligibility was not properly determined. The student, who became a U.S. citizen at age 32, was a Kuwaiti national who resided in the U.S. on a student visa from age 18, failed to register with the Selective Service before age 26 and was unable to register after age 26. The student had obtained and submitted a Selective Service status letter with the code RL, indicating that he met no exemption conditions, that its records showed he was sent one or more letters informing him of the registration requirement, and that its records contained no indication of failed delivery of registration notices.

To support his claim that his failure to register was not knowing and willful, the student submitted written statements to MCC.com describing his situation during the period when he was required to register. His initial statement dated 8/3/11 indicated he was not a citizen or permanent U.S. resident at age 18, did not become a citizen until age 32, and had not been told of the registration requirement. Since the Selective Service status letter dated 9/7/11 with the RL code indicated he had received notices of the registration requirement, the student submitted further statements dated 9/19/11 and 2/23/12 indicating he had married in the U.S. and started seeking permanent residency status at age 21. This process would have subjected him to the oversight of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, although he claimed he was neither questioned nor informed about the Selective Service registration requirements by INS agents or interviewers, which does not seem likely. To explain his failure to receive Selective Service

registration notices, the student further claimed that he had moved repeatedly and even left the U.S. at one point prior to age 26.

This claim is contradicted by other documentation in the student's file. A transcript from Wright State University indicates this student was accepted there with transfer credits from his attendance at Cuyahoga Community College from 1987, when he was age 18, to 1989. He then attended Wright State University from summer quarter 1989 until March 1996, when he received his bachelor's degree at age 26. His college attendance from ages 18 to 26, along with his marriage and pursuit of an immigration status change subjecting him to INS scrutiny, does not seem to comport with his contradictory claim to have moved around considerably and to have been out of the U.S. prior to age 26.

MCC.com failed to properly resolve the contradictory claims and discrepant information in Student #12's file. Given these discrepancies and the Selective Service status letter, which should have been considered negatively according to the Department's guidance, the institution's determination that the student's failure to register for the Selective Service was not knowing and willful, and that he was therefore eligible for Title IV aid, was not properly supported. The institution improperly disbursed \$7,614 to a student whose eligibility had not been properly determined.

**Institutional Action Taken to Resolve Noncompliance:** On 11/27/2013, MCC.com provided evidence of repayment of \$7,614 to the Federal Direct Loan program on 11/26/2013.

**Final Program Review Determination:** MCC.com has taken the corrective actions necessary to resolve this finding. MCC.com remains liable to the Department for the Cost of Funds interest for the improperly retained funds. As this amount would be de minimus if quantified, no demand for repayment is made at this time. Therefore, MCC.com may consider this finding closed, with no further action required.

**Recommendation:**

The following is a recommendation based upon observations made by the review team during the program review. MCC.com is not required to provide a response to nor act upon this recommendation. However, the review team believes that adoption of this recommendations will assist the institution in its administration of Title IV, HEA program funds.

The review team observed that MCC.com was subject to a show-cause action by ACCET, its accreditor, regarding the institution's placement data, among other concerns. The reviewers therefore attempted to verify MCC.com's placement information for students identified as graduates within the review sample. For a significant number of these graduates, institutional officials were required to provide updated or corrected employer contact information to enable the reviewers to verify placement. The reviewers suggested that MCC.com should thoroughly examine and correct the data it used and provided to ACCET for placement verification purposes. It was not clear to the reviewers why different institutional officials seemed to have

access to different employer contact information. Nor was it clear why a greater sense of urgency had not already developed on the part of MCC.com officials, given ACCET's follow-up letters expressing dissatisfaction with the institution's response to the show-cause action.

**Record Retention:**

Program records relating to the period covered by the program review must be retained until the later of: resolution of the loans, claims or expenditures questioned in the program review; or the end of the retention period otherwise applicable to the record under 34 C.F.R. § 668.24(e).

We would like to express our appreciation for the courtesy and cooperation extended during the review. If you have any questions concerning this report, please call Sheri Wild at (312) 730-1539.

Sincerely,

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Douglas Parrott  
Division Director

Enclosure: Appendix A, Student Sample - **REDACTED**

cc: Mr. Kevin Galati, Executive Director of Financial Services

Ohio State Board of Career Colleges and Schools

Accrediting Council for Continuing Education and Training